

1 DANIEL J. BERGESON, Bar No. 105439
dbergeson@be-law.com
2 JOHN W. FOWLER, Bar No. 037463
jfowler@be-law.com
3 MELINDA M. MORTON, Bar No. 209373
mmorton@be-law.com
4 BERGESON, LLP
5 303 Almaden Boulevard, Suite 500
San Jose, CA 95110-2712
Telephone: (408) 291-6200
6 Facsimile: (408) 297-6000

7 Attorneys for Plaintiff
VERIGY US, INC.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN JOSE DIVISION

12 | VERIGY US, INC, a Delaware Corporation.

| Case No. C07 04330 RMW (HRL)

13 || Plaintiff,

STIPULATION SELECTING ADR PROCESS [ADR L.R. 3-5]

15 ROMI OMAR MAYDER, an individual;
16 WESLEY MAYDER, an individual; SILICON
TEST SYSTEMS, INC., a California Corporation;
17 and SILICON TEST SOLUTIONS, LLC, a
California Limited Liability Corporation,
inclusive,

Judge: Honorable Ronald M. Whyte

Defendants.

Complaint Filed: August 22, 2007
Trial Date: None Set

1 Counsel report that they have met and conferred regarding ADR and have reached the
2 following stipulation pursuant to Civil L.R. 16-8 and ADR L.R. 3-5.

3 The parties stipulate to participate in the following ADR process:

4 || Private Process:

X Private ADR (*mutually agreeable private mediator to conduct mediation*)

7 || The parties agree to hold the ADR session by

X the presumptive deadline (*The deadline is 90 days from the date of the order referring the case to an ADR process unless otherwise ordered.*)

Private Process:

1 _X_ Private ADR (*mutually agreeable private mediator to conduct mediation after parties*
2 *have engaged in document discovery*)

(For e-filers, please consult General Order No. 45, Section X regarding signatures.)

1 SIGNATURE AND CERTIFICATION BY PARTIES AND LEAD TRIAL COUNSEL

2 Pursuant to Civ. L.R. 16 and ADR L.R. 3-5(b), the undersigned certifies that he has read
3 either the handbook entitled "Dispute Resolution Procedures in the Northern District of
4 California," on the Court's ADR Internet site <www.adr.cand.uscourts.gov>, discussed the
5 available dispute resolution options provided by the Court and private entities, and considered
6 whether this case might benefit from any of them.

7 Dated: November 19, 2007

8 _____/s/
9 Kenneth M. Siegel for Plaintiff Verigty US, Inc.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 SIGNATURE AND CERTIFICATION BY PARTIES AND LEAD TRIAL COUNSEL

2 Pursuant to Civ. L.R. 16 and ADR L.R. 3-5(b), the undersigned certifies that he or she has
3 read either the handbook entitled "Dispute Resolution Procedures in the Northern District of
4 California," on the Court's ADR Internet site <www.adr.cand.uscourts.gov>, discussed the
5 available dispute resolution options provided by the Court and private entities, and considered
6 whether this case might benefit from any of them.

7 Dated: November 19, 2007

/s/

8 Melinda M. Morton, Counsel for Plaintiff

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

SIGNATURE AND CERTIFICATION BY PARTIES AND LEAD TRIAL COUNSEL

Pursuant to Civ. L.R. 16 and ADR L.R. 3-5(b), the undersigned certifies that he or she has
read either the handbook entitled "Dispute Resolution Procedures in the Northern District of
California," on the Court's ADR Internet site <www.adr.cand.uscourts.gov>, discussed the
available dispute resolution options provided by the Court and private entities, and considered
whether this case might benefit from any of them.

Dated: November 21, 2007

/s/

Romi Mayder for Defendants
Romi Mayder, Silicon Test Systems, Inc.
and Silicon Test Solutions, LLC

Dated: December 4, 2007

/S/

Wesley Mayder for Defendant
Wesley Mayder

1 SIGNATURE AND CERTIFICATION BY PARTIES AND LEAD TRIAL COUNSEL

2 Pursuant to Civ. L.R. 16 and ADR L.R. 3-5(b), the undersigned certifies that he or she has
3 read either the handbook entitled "Dispute Resolution Procedures in the Northern District of
4 California," on the Court's ADR Internet site <www.adr.cand.uscourts.gov>, discussed the
5 available dispute resolution options provided by the Court and private entities, and considered
6 whether this case might benefit from any of them.

7 Dated: November 21, 2007

/s/

8 Daniel S. Mount, Counsel for Defendants

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 [PROPOSED] ORDER

2 Pursuant to the foregoing Stipulation Selecting ADR Process submitted by the parties, the
3 captioned matter is hereby referred to mediation.

4
5 IT IS SO ORDERED.

6
7 Dated: _____

8 HON. JUDGE RONALD M. WHYTE
9 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28